

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

4 MARIA RUTENBURG,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 TWITTER, INC.,

8 Defendant.

9

Case No. 4:21-cv-00548-YGR

10

11 **ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR
12 LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED
13 COMPLAINT**

14

15 Re: Dkt. No. 27

16

17 The Court previously dismissed this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Dkt. No. 18 21), denied plaintiff Maria Rutenburg's first motion for leave to file a second amended complaint 19 (Dkt. No. 25), and subsequently entered judgment in this action. (Dkt. No. 26.) Now before the 20 Court is Rutenburg's second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, filed post 21 judgment. (Dkt. No. 27.) Having reviewed the motion as well as the docket of this action, the 22 second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

23

24 Rutenburg's second motion is nothing more than an improper motion for reconsideration of the Court's earlier decisions. (*See* N.D. Cal. L.R. 7-9.) Specifically, Rutenburg does not 25 demonstrate any (1) material difference now in fact or law, (2) the emergence of new material 26 facts or a change in law occurring after the time of the orders, or (3) a manifest failure of the 27 Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were previously presented. 28 The second motion is otherwise appropriately denied under the grounds and reasoning previously 29 articulated by the Court in the prior orders. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 21, 25.)

30

31 Accordingly, the second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

32

33 This Order terminates Docket Number 27.

34

35 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

36

37 Dated: June 22, 2021

38


39 YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
40 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE